

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of: V. Suen et al.

Application No.: 10/614,956

Group No.: 2819

Filed: 8 July 2003

Examiner: J. Crawford

Title: Apparatus and Methods for Improved Input/Output Cells

**TELEPHONE INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

*Applicant submits this telephone interview summary to meet the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b), and according to the requirements listed in MPEP § 713.04.*

Date/Type of Interview: telephone interview conducted on 20-21 February 2007

Examiner: J. Crawford

Name of Applicant's attorney: Dan Fishman

Exhibits shown or demonstrations conducted: None

Claims discussed: 1 and 17

Prior art discussed: New (US 6,242,945)

General thrust of Examiner's arguments: see below

General thrust of Applicant's arguments: see below

Agreement reached and general nature of the agreement: see below

Proposed amendments: None

The Examiner contacted the undersigned on 20 February 2007 to suggest a new reference could apply to claims 1 and 17. The Examiner updated his search after Applicants submittal of an amendment after final rejection that rejected the only then rejected claims. The new prior art reference (issued to "New" as US Patent 6,242,945) was suggested by the Examiner to either anticipate or render obvious independent claims 1 and 17. The Examiner pointed generally to elements of New's figure 8. The Examiner suggested that merging claims 2 and 18 into claims 1 and 17, respectively, would obtain an allowance over the new reference.

Undersigned attorney discussed the reference with the client and contacted the Examiner on 21 February 2007 to dispute the Examiner's suggestion that the new reference rendered the claims unpatentable. Undersigned attorney suggested that the New reference failed to show a "duty cycle controller" as distinct from the "slew rate controller" cited by the Examiner in the New reference and also failed to show the switchable termination of the claimed invention as distinct from the pull-up and pull-down resistors shown in New.

After consultation with two primary examiners (identity unknown to the undersigned attorney), the Examiner now agrees that the new reference does not render the remaining claims unpatentable. The Examiner suggested a Notice of Allowance would be forthcoming. Undersigned attorney requested that the new references (United States Patent Number 6, 242,945) be included on the front page of the patent as a cited reference.

Date: 21 February 2007

/Daniel Fishman/  
**SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER**

Daniel Fishman, Reg. No. 35,512  
Attorney for Applicants and Assignee  
Duft Bornsen & Fishman, LLP  
Telephone: (303) 786-7687  
Facsimile: (303) 786-7691